APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,168	06/14/2001	Cary Lee Bates	ROC920010105US1	6848

7590   08/16/2002

Grant A. Johnson
IBM Corporation - Dept. 917
3605 Highway 52 North
Rochester, MN 55901

EXAMINER
TRAN, QUOC DUC

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2643	

DATE MAILED: 08/16/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/881,168	BATES ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Quoc D Tran	2643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _14 June 2001_ .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2.   Claims 1-2, 7-10, 13, 16-17 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Wallace (5,988,497).

Consider claim 1, Wallace teaches a computer implemented method for implementing

calling card security comprising the steps of: receiving a telephone call request from a calling

card user; checking a plurality of predefined options to identify user selected options for the

calling card; and processing said telephone call request from the calling card user responsive to

said identified user selected options for the calling card (col. 5 line 45 – col. 6 line 44; Fig. 1).

Consider claim 2, Wallace teaches a computer implemented method for implementing

calling card security as recited in claim 1 includes the steps of identifying a telephone call

request to setup a calling card from a calling card user and performing setup to receive and store

user selected options for the calling card (col. 5 line 45 – col. 6 line 44; Fig. 5).

Consider claim 7, Wallace teaches a computer implemented method for implementing

calling card security as recited in claim 1 wherein the step of checking said plurality of

predefined options to identify user selected options for the calling card includes the step of

checking for a limited number of calls from a specified telephone number being enabled (col. 2

lines 4-15).

Consider claim 8, Wallace teaches a computer implemented method for implementing calling card security wherein the step of processing said telephone call request from the calling card user responsive to said identified user selected options for the calling card includes the step of comparing a number of calls from said specified telephone number with a threshold limit responsive to said limited number of calls from a specified telephone number being enabled; and terminating said telephone call request when said number of calls from said specified telephone number exceeds said threshold limit (col. 1 line 63 – col. 2 line 29).

Consider claim 9, Wallace teaches a computer implemented method for implementing calling card security wherein the step of checking said plurality of predefined options to identify user selected options for the calling card includes the step of checking for calls to a limited area being enabled (col. 2 lines 4-15).

Consider claim 10, Wallace teaches a computer implemented method for implementing calling card security wherein the step of processing said telephone call request from the calling card user responsive to said identified user selected options for the calling card includes the step of comparing a telephone number dialed with said limited area responsive to calls to said limited area being enabled; and terminating said telephone call request when said telephone number dialed is outside said limited area (col. 1 line 63 – col. 2 line 29).

Consider claim 13, Wallace teaches a computer program product for implementing calling card security with a server computer, said computer program product including a plurality of computer executable instructions stored on a computer readable medium, wherein said instructions, when executed by said server computer, cause the server computer to perform the steps of: responsive to a user request to setup a calling card, performing setup to receive and

store user selected options for said calling card; receiving a telephone call request from a calling card user; responsive to said telephone call request from the calling card user, checking a plurality of predefined options to identify user selected options for the calling card; and processing said telephone call request from the calling card user responsive to said identified user selected options for the calling card (col. 5 line 45 – col. 6 line 44; Fig. 1).

Consider claim 16, Wallace teaches a computer program product for implementing calling card security wherein the step responsive to said telephone call request from the calling card user, checking a plurality of predefined options to identify user selected options for the calling card includes the step of checking for a limited area for calls being enabled by the calling card user for use of the calling card (col. 2 lines 4-15).

Consider claim 17, Wallace teaches a computer program product for implementing calling card security wherein the step responsive to said telephone call request from the calling card user, checking a plurality of predefined options to identify user selected options for the calling card includes the step of checking for a limited number of calls from a specified area or a specified telephone number being enabled by the calling card user for use of the calling card (col. 2 lines 4-15).

Consider claim 19, Wallace teaches wherein the step of processing said telephone call request from the calling card user responsive to said identified user selected options for the calling card includes the step of comparing said identified user selected options for the calling card with said telephone call request from the calling card user and terminating the telephone call when said telephone call request differs from said identified user selected options for the calling card (col. 6 lines 6-33).

Consider claim 20, Wallace teaches a system for implementing calling card security comprising: a server computer; a calling card security program including a plurality of computer executable instructions stored on a computer readable medium, wherein said instructions, when executed by said server computer, cause the server computer to perform the steps of: receiving a telephone call request from a calling card user; checking a plurality of predefined options to identify user selected options for the calling card; and processing said telephone call request from the calling card user responsive to said identified user selected options for the calling card (col. 5 line 45 – col. 6 line 44; Fig. 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 3-4, 11-12, 14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallace (5,988,497) in view of Jankowitz et al (5,875,236).

Consider claims 3 and 14, Wallace did not clearly suggest wherein the step of checking said plurality of predefined options to identify user selected options for the calling card includes the step of checking for use from a specified telephone number being enabled. However, Jankowitz et al suggested such (abstract; col. 5 line 42 – col. 6 line 56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

incorporate the teaching of Jankowitz et al into view of Wallace in order to increase security and integrity of the calling card network.

Consider claim 4, as discussed above, Jankowitz et al teach wherein the step of processing said telephone call request from the calling card user responsive to said identified user selected options for the calling card includes the step of checking for said telephone call request originating from a specified telephone number responsive to an identified use from a specified telephone number being enabled; and said telephone call request responsive to said telephone call request not originating from said specified telephone number (col. 5 line 42 – col. 6 line 56).

Consider claim 11 and 18, Wallace did not clearly suggest wherein the step of checking said plurality of predefined options to identify user selected options for the calling card includes the step of checking for a limited time for calls being enabled. However, Jankowitz et al suggested such (abstract; col. 5 line 42 – col. 6 line 56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Jankowitz et al into view of Wallace in order to increase security and integrity of the calling card network.

Consider claim 12, Wallace did not clearly suggest wherein the step of processing said telephone call request from the calling card user responsive to said identified user selected options for the calling card includes the step of comparing a call duration with said limited time responsive to said limited time for calls being enabled; and terminating said call when said limited time for calls is exceeded. However, Jankowitz et al suggested such (abstract; col. 5 line 42 – col. 6 line 56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Jankowitz et al into view of Wallace in order to increase security and integrity of the calling card network.

5.   Claims 5-6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallace (5,988,497) in view of Sawyer et al (6,324,271).

Consider claim 5 and 15, Wallace did not clearly suggest wherein the step of checking said plurality of predefined options to identify user selected options for the calling card includes the step of checking for voice recognition being enabled. However, Sawyer et al suggested such (col. 2 line 53 – col. 3 line 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of sawyer et al into view of Wallace in order to increase security and integrity of the calling card network.

Consider claim 6, as discussed above, Sawyer et al teach wherein the step of processing said telephone call request from the calling card user responsive to said identified user selected options for the calling card includes the step of requesting the calling card user to speak a phrase responsive to voice recognition being enabled; comparing a received voice pattern with a stored voice pattern; and terminating said telephone call request when a match of the voice patterns is not found (col. 2 line 53 – col. 3 line 6).

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

7.   Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Facsimile responses should be faxed to:
(703) 872-9314
Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:
Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive
Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Quoc Tran** whose telephone number is **(703) 306-5643**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 to 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Curtis Kuntz,** can be reached on **(703) 305-4708**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the **Technology Center 2600** whose telephone number is **(703) 306-0377**.

MELUR RAMAKRISHNAIAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER